

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-5, 7-11, 14-15, 17-23, and 25-28 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 1, 4-5, 7-11, 14-15, 17-23, and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,081,780 (Lumelsky) in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). Applicant has amended claims 1, 11, and 21, and has canceled claims 25-28. No new matter was introduced.

Applicant urges that, at the very least, that Lumelsky and AAPA, either singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest text to speech synthesis *wherein extracting acoustic feature data from said audio signal comprises digitizing the spoken audio signal into a set of frames and transforming the digitized input waveforms into a set of feature vectors on a frame-by-frame basis by producing a multi-dimensional cepstra feature vector for a predetermined intervals of the spoken audio signal, concatenating frames to the left and to the right of a current frame to augment a current cepstral vector, and reducing the dimension of each augmented cepstral vector using linear discriminant analysis*, as essentially recited in claims 1, 11 and 21.

Lumelsky discloses a speech analyzer that provides spectrum parameters using Fourier analysis or a linear predictive analysis, however, there is no teaching or suggestion in Lumelsky of Applicant's sequence of steps for using cepstral analysis for *transforming the digitized input waveforms into a set of feature vectors on a frame-by-frame basis for extracting acoustic feature data from said audio signal*, as recited in claims 1, 11, and 21. Furthermore, the Examiner cited AAPA as teaching or suggesting alignment, not for *extracting acoustic feature data from said audio signal*. Thus, AAPA does not remedy the deficiencies of Lumelsky. Thus, Applicant urges that the combination of Lumelsky and AAPA does not teach or suggest all limitations of independent claims 1, 11, and 21, and therefore that a *prima facie* case of obviousness of those claims over Lumelsky and AAPA cannot be maintained. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 4-5, 7-10, 14-15, 17-20, and 22-23 all depend from either claims 1, 11, or 21, respectively, and are thus patentable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 11, and 21. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant urges that claims 1, 4-5, 7-11, 14-15, and 17-23 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated. Early and favorable action on this case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/4/08

By: David L. Heath
David L. Heath
Reg. No. 46,763
Attorney for Applicant

Mailing Address:

**F. Chau & Associates,
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury NY 11797
(516) 692-8888
(516) 692-8889 (FAX)**